REMARKS

Applicant has reviewed the Final Office Action mailed on October 18, 2004 as well as the art cited. Claims 1-11 are pending in this application.

Claim Objection

Claims 1 and 8 were objected to for informalities. Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 8 to overcome the objections. Further in regard to the objection to Claim 8, the Applicant traverses the Examiners assertion that the scope of the claim is unascertainable. The claim provides a method of operating a multi-mode DC/DC converter. The steps for doing this are set out in the elements of the claim. As amended, one of ordinary skill in the art would understand the scope of the Claim 8. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objection of Claim 8.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-9 and 11 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 27 and 29-34 of U.S. Patent No. 6,680,604.

A terminal disclaimer pursuant to 37 CFR 3.73(b) has been filed to overcome the double patenting rejection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 8-11 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(a) as being anticipated by acknowledged prior art as shown in Figures 1 and 3.

The Examiner had stated "figure 3, clearly shows the Traditional Droop (voltage droop) which is substantially symmetrical to the one to the one of performance optimized mode."

However, both Claim 1 and Claim 8 require symmetry "**throughout** the operational modes." As illustrated in Figure 3, the traditional droop of the battery-optimized mode is not

substantially symmetric. Accordingly, Figure 3, does not show what is claimed in Claim 1 and 8 of the present application.

The Examiner further stated "Figure 1 shows the use of a feedback loop to adjust the voltage droop and to alter a slope of a load line in accordance with an operating mode to adjust the voltage droop."

The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertion regarding Figure 1. Figure 1 is discussed on page 2, line 13 through page 5, line 25. In particular, please refer to Page 4, lines 16 through Page 5 line 7 of the present application where the asymmetrical feature of the droop is discussed. Moreover, Figure 1 does not illustrate what is claimed in Claim 1 and 8 of the present application.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 1 and 8 be withdrawn. Moreover, since dependant Claims 2-7 and 9-11 depend from and further define their respective patentably distinct independent Claims 1 and 8, the Applicant also requests the withdrawal to the rejection of these dependant claims. Since the Applicant believes the dependant claims are allowable for the above reason, further response to other rejection to these dependant claims may not have been put forth in this response. The Applicant, however, retains the right to address said rejections if a further response is necessary.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-11 are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at 612-455-1690.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12-17-04

Scott Lundberg
Reg. No. 41,958

Attorneys for Applicant
Fogg and Associates, LLC
P.O. Box 581339
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1339
T – (612) 332-4720
F – (612) 332-4731